Peter pursued,

OR

Dr. HEYLIN

Overtaken, Arrested, and Arraigned upon his three Appendixes,

{ 1. *Respondet Petrus.*
2. *Answer to the Post-haste Reply.*
3. *Advertisements on three Histories,* }

Of { *Mary* Queen of *Scots*, King *James*, and King *Charls*, }

Patch'd together in his

EXAMEN HISTORICUM,

For which the Doctor is brought to Censure,

By *WILLIAM SANDERSON*, Esq;

Ne quis vestrum patiatur ut alienarum rerum inspector.

LONDON,
Printed by *Tho. Leach*, 1658.

1876

DA422
1658
.S3

The Preface.

READers of Books may be divided into three ſorts, 1. for *Edification*, 2. for *Recreation*, 3. for *Cavillation*. But the laſt are the worſt, who peruſe writings of purpoſe to pick quarrels with them; which proceeds from an ignorant critical kind of pride or malignancy of Spirit, and may be compared to the Horſe fleſh flies, who in the end of Summer cannot ſee, yet by chance fall upon ſound fleſh, fly-blow it firſt, and then feed upon it. I ſhould not apply this kind of reading to any particular perſon, but that Dr. *Peter Heylin* appears ſo in the *Appendix* to his *Reſpondet Petrus*, and in the other two *Appendixes* to his *Examen Hiſtoricum*, wherein he falls upon the moſt frivial paſſages, and in a ſnarling petulant way.

I ſhall here only acquaint the Reader, that Doctor *Heylin* hath been too haſty in the Anſwer

ſwer of my *Poſt-haſte Reply* to his *Reſpondet Petrus*, which Anſwer was not till now made publique. Printed indeed it was, immediately after his former *Appendix*, but by the perſwaſion of his friends, I did ſuppreſſe it (excepting a few private Copies) until now that I find him with another *Appendix* in *Anſwer* to that *Reply* of mine, which I here publiſh out of a reſpect to him, leſt the world ſhould think ſo great a Maſter of defence ſhould fight with a ſhadow or a *non ens*: 'Tis worthy enough of him, how little ſoever the worth may be in it ſelf: And yet in earneſt I could have been content to have ſpared my ſelf and the Readers pains herein, if the Doctor had been ſo ingenuous to have crav'd pardon of me, as he hath done by letter of that other perſon (as I am informed) with whoſe Hiſtories he quarrel as he doth with mine.

POST-HASTE:
A REPLY TO PETER
(DOCTOR *HEYLIN'S*) APPENDIX;
TO HIS TREATISE,
INTITULED
Respondet Petrus &c.

BY
WILLIAM SANDERSON Esq;

LONDON,
Printed for the use of the Author. 1658.

POSTHUMOUS

JEPHTHAH

A

PENITENTIAL

APPENDIX

TO THE

TREATISE

ON

REPENTANCE

AND

FAITH.

BY

Printed by Bruce & Allen, 1828

The Contents

PEtrus his Preface examined;

A caſtigation of Doctor Heylin *for his ill Manners to the late Primate of all* Ireland;

And his ſcandalizing Doctor Prideaux *at Court in divers falſe Informations;*

With a Copy of his Anſwer to each;

And the Proteſtation he was compelled unto to cleer himſelf;

The Character given by Doctor Hackwell *of Doctor* Heylin;

Three paſſages replied unto and confirmed as before;

With

The Contents

With some seasonable good Counsell to the Doctor, if he have the will to accept thereof.

Post-haste

POST-HASTE.

A Reply to Peter (*Doctor* Heylin)

His Appendix to his Treatiſe, &c.

THere is a *Treatiſe* come forth the other day, Intituled *Reſpondet Petrus*; or an anſwer of *Peter Heylin* to Doctor *Bernard* &c. And although it be very large to ſmall purpoſe, yet at the 109th. Page, he adds an *Appendix* in anſwer to certain paſſages in Mr. *Sanderſons Hiſtory* of the late *King Charles, relating to the Lord Prymate*, The *Articles of Ireland*, and The *Earl of Straford*. And (as if it were ſo memorable a buſineſs to be kept upon Record) he gives us punctually the day, when he began to

undertake this *Taske*, and the time of his finiſhing; , In which I find little elſe true, but the confeſſing *of his infirmities, and his unfitneſs to enter into diſputes &c.* Inſtead of cleering himſelf, he hath added more ſpots to his former.

Indeed *Petrus* hath made haſt; for notwithſtanding the extremity of the ſeaſon (as he ſayes) and his languiſhing quartanague, he hobled up his anſwers for the middle of the *Term* following, *with as much eaſe, as Hoggs eate Acornes, or Pidgeons pick Peaſe.* Yet he was interrupted the publiſhing, by the *undertakers* with him; a dead *vacation* not profitable for the vent thereof; And ſo it came not forth untill juſt the firſt day of this *Midſomer Term*; By it, he hath both thriftily gotten the advantage of ſale, and enforceth his adverſaries to hunt dryfoot after him a whole long *Summers Vacation*; contemptible Grashoppers compared with ſuch a ſonne of *Anak* as himſelf; Only *Petrus* conſiders wiſely, that although *convicia ſpreta exoleſcunt &c.*

Short

Short liv'd Pamphlets (with which he hath been often bang'd) pass away upon the breath of Rumour, *but for him to be enrolled upon record in the body of an History, what is it lesse, than for him to live defam'd, and dye detestable, a scorne to these times and an ignominy to all ages following?* But who can help it, if a Man will make himself such? I wish he be not prophetick in it, which by this book he hath put hard for, Let him not blame me, tis the malefactor himself (not the judge who pronounceth justly) that is the Author of his own ruine.

And thus in briefe we have the *Preface* to his large *Treatise*; which I shall leave to such, whom it may concern, if they conceive it worthy of answering, for I find some learned Men are for the Negative, as if he had been in it, his self-revenger, and next doore to a *felo de se*, rather to be pitied, than opposed.

I shall only take notice of his *Appendix*, and shew him to the Reader by that light by which he longs to be seene (wherein

Petrus falls upon me) not so much answering as to shew how little he deserves it. I have been a while considering, which part to take of that double Counsell of *Solomon* in the like case, *Answer not &c. And yet answer &c.* I concluded upon the latter in this *Post-Hast*, that the *Term* might not want an enterlude at the *ending*, as well as it had by his Book, at the beginning of it.

And now let me meet my *Petrus*, who spends 17 whole Pages in the combate with me, taking in his large *Frontispeice* or the Contents of his *Appendix*, which might have well stood for the whole. So have we seen a daring coward practise on the *Stage* to fence with his supposed foe, when all that while it was but with his own hat and feather. How much time doth *Petrus* spend, to hear himself speak, imagining the Reader to be bound up to his sence and audience.

Indeed I had warning heretofore not to meddle with him, and was told, that although

though he was blind, yet he with his helpers, could ſee as far into a *Millſtone* as any other Man: And that if he ſhould be concerned in my Hiſtory (as how could he ſcape) he would reprint himſelf, and be thereby well paid for his paines.

And truly I conceive it no diſcretion for me, to make it my buſineſs other than to dry-blow beat him, ſince he is not herein worthy of bleeding. For to ſay much were but to give him further occaſion to aſſume freſh credit of copeing with the deceaſed, now at reſt, whom he hath endeavoured to diſturbe, even the moſt Reverend name and living fame, of that approved learned Prelate, the late Arch-Biſhop of *Armagh*, Prymate of all *Ireland*.

But to be a little ſerious with him, 'tis no newes for Doctor *Heylin* to be a diſturber of pious and eminent Men, while they were living, of which (now he is not like to live long himſelf) tis time to think upon repenting, I ſhall upon this occaſion only inſtance in his demeanour towards Doctor

Doctor Heylins disturbance of Doctor Prideaux.

Prideaux, at and after the taking of his degree in *Oxford* Anno 1635. Who catching at ſome particulars which fell from Doctor *Prideaux* in the diſcuſſing the queſtions * given by Doctor *Heylin*, ſcandalized him at Court to the late King being then at *Woodſtock*.

*Informat ex Articul: 20.

An Eccleſia authoritatem habeat
In fidei controverſiis determinandis,
Interpretandis ſacras ſcripturas,
Decernendi ritus et ceremonias.

} affirm

Upon which the Doctor was compelled to make his defence; with a proteſtation under his hand againſt thoſe falſe Informations given in againſt him; Pretending to have been croſs to the *Articles*, and in ſpecial to the 20th, *of the Church of England*, branched into poſitions *viz.*

1 *That the Church is* Mera Chimæra.

2 *That it teacheth and determines nothing,*

3 *That controverſies might better be referred to the* Vniverſities *than to the Church.*

4 *That learned men in the* Vniverſities *might determine of controverſies without the*

Biſhops

Biſhops or acquainting them with them.

To theſe Doctor *Prideaux* was fain to make anſwer, which to ſatisfie the deſire of the Reader (not being heretofore publiſht) I ſhall give him a tranſcript as followeth viz.

The anſwer of Doctor *Prideaux* to the Information given in againſt him by Doctor *Heylin.*

Theſe paſſages imperfectly catched at by the Informer were not poſitions of mine, (for I deteſt them, as they are layd, for impious and ridiculous) but oppoſitions according to my place propoſed for the further clearing of the truth; to which the Reſpondent was to give ſatisfaction. And this generall proteſtation I hope takes off all that can be laid againſt me, in the particulars. Notwithſtanding to touch on each of them as they are layd.

1 *To the Firſt, I never ſaid that the Church was* Mera Chimæra *as it is, or, hath a being, and ought to be beleived; but as the Reſpondent by his anſwers made it: In which I conceived him to ſwerve from the Article, where his queſtions were taken.*

2 *To*

2 *To the Second my argument was to this purpose,* Omnis actio eſt ſuppoſitorum, vel ſingularium:

Ergo Eccleſia in abſtracto nihil docet, aut determinat, ſed per hos aut illos Epiſcopos, Paſtores, Doctores, &c. homo non diſputat ſed Petrus et Johannes.

3. 4. *The Third and Fourth may be well put together: my proſecution was, that the Vniverſities are eminent parts, and Seminaries of the Church, and had better opportunity to diſcuſs controverſies, than diverſe other aſſemblies; Not by any meanes to determine them, but to prepare them for the determination of Eccleſiaſticall aſſemblies, of* Synods, Councells, Biſhops, *that have ſuperiour Authority, wherein they might doe ſervice to the Church, and thoſe ſuperiours not perſcribe any thing unto them; As the debating of a point by learned Counſell, makes the eaſier paſſage for the Benches ſentence: And this was urged only as commended, not as neceſſary.*

The

The Queenes Almoner was preſent. *Informer.*

I am told noe. For he departed (as they ſay) that were in the ſame ſeat with him, being tired, as it ſhould ſeem, by the tedious preface of the * Reſpondent, before the diſputations began; but be it ſo, or otherwiſe, to what purpoſe this is interpoſed, I know not? *Doctor Prideaux.* *Doctor Heylin.*

Vpon an occaſion of mentioning the abſolute decree, he brake forth into a great and long diſcourſe, that his mouth was ſhut by Authority, elſe he would maintain that truth contra omnes, qui ſunt in vivis *which fetch't a great* hum *from the Country Miniſters that were there.* *Informer.*

This Argument I confeſs was unexpectedly caſt in by another, but bent (as I took) it againſt ſome what I have written in that behalf, which the Reſpondent, not endeavouring to clear, I was put upon it to ſhew, in what ſence I took *abſolutum decretum*, which indeed I ſaid, I was able to *Doctor Prideaux.*

maintain against any, as my predeceſſors in that place had done, This was not in a long diſcourſe, as it is ſuggeſted, but in as ſhort a ſolution as is uſually brought in Schooles, to a doubt on the by.

And from this I took off the oppo-nents further proceeding in obedience to Authority; whereupon if a *hum* ſucceeded, it was more then I uſe to take notice of, it might be as well of diſlike, as of Approbation, and of other Auditors as ſoon as Country Minniſters. A *Hiſs* I am ſure was given before, when the Reſpondent excluded King and Parliament from being parts of the Church; But I remember whoſe practiſe it is to be [illegible] I had rather to bear and forbear, and end with this Proteſtation.

The accuſer of the Brethren. Rev. 12. 10.

Proteſtatio

Proteſtation.

THat as I beleive the Catholick Church in my Creed, ſoe I reverence this Church of England, wherein I had my Baptiſme, and whole breeding, as a moſt eminent member of it. To the Doctrine, and diſcipline of this Church, have I often hitherto ſubſcribed, and by Gods grace conſtantly adhered, And reſolve by the ſame aſſiſtance, according to my abilitie under his Majeſties protection faithfully to maintain againſt the Papiſts or any other that ſhall oppoſe it. The prelacie of our Reverend Biſhops I have ever defended in my place, which I dare ſay hath been more often, and with greater paines taking than moſt of thoſe have done, who have received greater encouragements from their Lordſhips: I deſire nothing but the continuance of my Vocation in a peaceable courſe, that after all my paines taking in the place of his Majeſties Profeſſor, almoſt for this 18. yeares together,

Doctor Prideaux Proteſtation.

* Such as proceeded Doctors under him of whom Doctor Heylin had been newly one.

*my *sonns especially, be not countenanced in my declining age to vilifie me, & vex me; so that I end the remainder of my time, (which likely must be short, and cannot be long) in heartie prayer for his Majesty my onely Master and Patron; for the Reverend Bishops, the State, and all his Majesties Subjects and his affaires; and continue my utmost endeavour to doe all faithfull service to the Church wherein I live, to whose Authority I have ever, and doe hereby submit my self, and Studies, to be according to Gods word directed or converted.*

Thus was this learned and eminent Professor of divinity traduced and disturbed; let the application be the patience and disregard of the Reader, when in this book he finds the like attempted by the same person, upon the late Arch-Bishop of *Armagh.*

Doctor Hackwells Character of Doctor Heylin.

And yet, what slender accompt is to be made of his language that way, may appear by the Character, which a learned person, and one of note, *George Hackwell* Arch-

Deacon

Deacon of *Surrey* and of *Exeter* Colledg in *Oxford*, gives of him which I have under his own hand in a letter of his to a friend; Where, ſpeaking of Mr. *Heylin* (ſince Doctor) whom he ſtiles, *the Patron of that pretend d Saint* (*St George*,) hath theſe words of him, *viz.*

"In the ſecond impreſſion of his book "where he hath occaſion to ſpeak "of the Roman writers, eſpecially the "*Legendaries*, he magnifies them more, and "when he mentions our men he vilefies "them more than he did in his firſt Editi- "on; But the matter is not much, what he "ſaith of one or the other, the condition "of the man, being ſuch, as his word "hardly paſſeth, either for commendation, "or a ſlander.

By this you may ſee that my adverſary had good cauſe to diſguiſe his name, and ſo would I too, were it under ſuch an Ignominious character. This is the fourth time he hath done it; I expect in time he will make up the number of *Labans* change of

Jacobs wages. Here is a *Proteus* indeed (which he would have put upon me) *Anonymus*, *obſervator*, *obſervator* Reſcued, *Rejoynder* and now *Petrus*. 'Tis well he hangs by his chriſtian name; he hath in this preſumed, beyond any Pope, who though they have aſſumed *Paul*, the fift time, yet none hath ſtiled himſelf *Petrus*. We have now the one half of him, we ſhall have the other the next, either *conjunctim*, or *diviſim*, it matters not.

He begins with his fancie of my being Doctor *Bernards Reſerve*, *in clearing the whole proceedings of the Lord Prymate in the buſineſs of the Earl of* Strafford; *and in the Examination and moderation of all paſſages, between Mr.* l'Eſtrange *and him.* I ſhall ſatiſfie the Reader upon what occaſion I undertoke it.

The occaſion why I undertook his obſervations on Mr. l'Eſtrange.

So ſoon as that *Anonymus* of an *obſervator* on Mr. *l'Eſtrange*, came to the Prymates hands, he was pleaſed to ſhew it to me; and finding the Author ſo apt upon a ſlender occaſion to bleamiſh him; (ſuppoſing him

him to be ſome Romiſh Agent whom he diſdaining to Anſwer,) deſired me in the proſecution of my Hiſtory (as it lay in my way) to vindicate him, (though not long after I was told by his Bookſeller, that the Author was Doctor *Heylin* In order thereunto he acquainted me with ſuch paſſages as did concern that of the Earl of *Strafford*; whoſe commands I preſently effected; intending (then) to have ſet it out by it ſelf, leaſt the Doctors Malice ſhould Gangreen by neglect. But the Lord Prymates deceaſe immediately following, it was referred to my Hiſtory with ſome freſh Notions more proper, which in my abſence was neglected by the *Preſs*; and at my return, they being inſerted have given cauſe of *Interſections* in the Impreſſion, between *fol.* 108 and 09. With which *Petrus* is ſo much troubled, and ſpends his breath in a diſpute with himſelf, *whether it were mine or* Doctor *Bernards?* And why ſo jealous, good *Petrus?* Firſt (ſaith he) *becauſe* Mr. *Sanderſon before in his Preface makes* Doctor *Heylin* *Append:* pa. 142

lin a perſon of ſome fame and great ability. That (poſſibly) might be my miſtake as the next in my ſpeaking reprochfully, of him, is his: Indeed I acknowledg that Doctor *Heylin* deſerves Characters of ſeverall kinds, as moſt men may diſcover, who conſult his writings; and ſo *Cato's*, leſſon learnt by him long agoe *Convenient nulli* &c. will better ſerve the turn to decipher him, than mee.

Secondly, (ſaith he) Mr. *Anderſon* in his Hiſtory fol. 200. informs us, *that in Anno.* 1635. *There was a Synod held in* Ireland *&c. But in his foyſted Argument he ſpeakes the Contrary.* Good *Petrus* conſult ſome true friends, that will read aright to you, and you will find the ſeverall Folio's you mention, not to be any thing contrary, which are too tedious to inſert in this ſhort Caſtigation.

Three points of mine quarrelled by Petrus.

Three points there are in which *Petrus* fancies me, to act for Doctor *Bernard.*

1 *The acquitting the Lord Primate from the diſtinction of a Politicall and a perſonall conſcience.*

conſcience. And yet it is confeſſed by himſelf to *have been done to my hand by Mr.* Howell's *atteſtation of my hiſtory,* (who was concerned in thoſe words.)

2 *The proving that the Articles of* Ireland *were not abrogated, & thoſe of the Church of* England *inſerted in their ſtead.* And yet he hath prevented any further confirmation of either, by his own confeſſing of his *being too much credulous in beleiving and inconſiderate in publiſhing ſuch miſtaken intelligence.* Which are his own words folio 87. And I could wiſh that in the *Errata* of the next Edition of his *Hiſtory of the Sabbaoth* (if the world be ever troubled with it again) he would Record this Ingenuity of his (being ſuch a rarity in him) ſo as to retract it, and howſoever he is much offended at the Primates expreſſions, *viz. Nor ſhames he to affirm as being a Notorious untruth* &c. Truly with me it ſeemes a gentle penance for ſo preſumptuous an aſſertion, and pertinaciouſly continuing in it theſe many yeares, till he was thus convict; de-

faming not only a ſingle perſon, but a whole Nation.

3 *That the Lord Prymate bear no grudge to the Earl of* Strafford, *ſo as to adviſe the King to paſs the Bill of Attainder.* This (whoſoever he accounts the Actor) hath been ſufficiently cleared alſo, and needs no repetition here.

For the term of *Sophiſtry*, (for which he is alſo much offended with the Prymate) he hath in the Iudgment of divers, made it good, throughout his book, which are ſo many, that they would find as much work for an obſervator, as he ſaith my Hiſtory will afford him: I ſhall only trouble the Reader with one inſtance (*ex ungue Leonem*, by this you may judg of the reſt) which is in ſuch great Characters, that he who rides poſt, may read it without ſtopping.

'Tis folio 63. where he repeating a Quotation of the *Prymate* in the concluſion of his Letter to Doctor *Twiſs*; *viz.* *That* Gregory *the great, eſteemed it to be the Doctrine*

doctrine of the Preachers of Antichriſt; who at his coming ſhall cauſe both the Lords day, and *the Sabaoth, to be kept, or celebrated from doing any worke;*) *Petrus,* in his pretended anſwer, hath blindly miſtaken the Copulative *and,* for the diſunctive *or* (though the *Prymate* in the next words, had given him warning of that Stumble:) And ſo upon a falſe ſent he runs away with the Hunt, as if it muſt neceſſarily follow from thence *That it is the doctrine of the Preachers of Antichriſt that no manner of work be done on the Saturday* or *the Sunday:* And from that ſurmiſe, he makes an application (of which, I leave it to others to give the ſenſe.) *What will become* (ſaith he) *of our* Engliſh *Sabbatarians and their Abettors, who impoſe as many reſtraints of this kind, upon Chriſtian people, as ever were impoſed on the Jewes, by the Scribes and Phariſees?* And in Concluſion he attempts to put out our Eies alſo, in perſwading us again; *That 'tis all one to ſay, on the Saturday* and *the Sunday; as on the Saturday,* or *the Sunday;* As

if unity and diviſion; conjunction and ſeparation, were alike with him: And it ſeemes by this, that his Nature is moſt addicted to the latter.

Append: p. 195. As for that great offence taken by him in the miſtake of *weakneſs*, for *incredulity*; and *Idleneſs*, for *Inconſideration* in the printing of the *Prymates* Letter: There is no ſuch difference, either in quantity or quality; but that if he can ſwallow the *one*, (as he hath done even now) he may as eaſily digeſt the *other*: And it being but a copy, it might as well happen as other greater miſtakes have been in my abſence between the Margin and the body of that letter.

Though 'tis poſſible for *Petrus* to ſhew his guilt of *Idleneſs*, to make more work for the Preſs to no purpoſe. Which petulant brain of his, may be excuſed by the want of that *ſenſe*, which might divert his thoughts, otherwiſe.

Append: p. 147. And for what elſe remaines, concerning the *Biſhops* whether ſent *for*, or ſent *to* the King?

King? *Or whether the Judges were* willing *or* unwilling *to deliver their Judgment againſt the votes of the Parliament?* I refer the Reader to what hath been ſaid in the Hiſtory, too tedious to recite.

As for the challengers threats with which he concludes, (hereafter) to commit a publique Riot on my whole Hiſtory; and therein to be made immortall, by being loud and troubleſome. He that marcheth againſt the *Ocean* may no doubt take abundance of Cockle-ſhells Captive. I confeſs ingeniouſly, there may be miſtakes in the body of ſo large an Hiſtory, which will be amended in the next Impreſſion, as it is ſodainly intended; wherein, your oblique Information, or any civill advertiſement of others will direct me: Seeing (as *Petrus* ſaith) abilities not governed by Infallibility, cannot exempt a man from being obnoxious to miſtakes, with which his own Pamphlets are peſtered. But ſpare your Intelligence in the diſquiſition of one particular concerning the Chil-

dren of Mr. *John Hambden* of *Buckingham* Shire, which is confeſſed an *Errata*, and muſt be thus corrected: *That he died of his wounds, and left three Sonnes compleat Perſons both of body and mind*; what ere ſiniſter Report then gave occaſion of the miſtake.

And now (*Petrus*) at parting: I could find in my heart to give you a little good Counſell: *Be not ſo wilde an* Iſhmaelite, *as to have your hand againſt every man, and provoking every mans hand againſt you.*

Take the advice given to your nameſake: *Peter, put up thy ſword again into his place.* Leave off this croſs-grain humour, ſtudying the injury againſt ſuch Perſons, as the late eminent *Prymate*, ſo far above you in learning and reputation, that wiſe men look upon your language, like the barking at the Moon; or a mad-man throwing up a ſharp ſtone, which falls on his own pate.

This your laſt Book, having made you ſuch a Bankrupt in point of reputation with

with moſt men, that all the charitable collections of your numerous helpers, will not eaſily recruite you.

I reverence your function, and mervail that many of your Bookes do ſo little concern it, rather to the diſhonour than otherwiſe, and I am not at all obliged to reſpect your perſon. Your travail hath been much earthy, at which you began, had you continued that Iourney, you might have amended your own Errours. What is otherwiſe (as the obſervations of the *Lords day*, or of Perſons of piety, who were and are for it) you have been in a continuall combate againſt both.

Your own friends conceive you unfortunate, to the diſturbance of the Church in each; For my part, ſo ſoon as I find you reformed, I ſhall contribute my endeavours, that your credit, now out of joint, may be ſet right again. Your own Pen that broke you muſt repair you, though as yet I am among the number of thoſe that therein deſpair. And as you have been a

man

man ſingular by your ſelf, ſo I leave you to your ſelf, & when you appear again armed; I ſhall be ready to meet you at your own weapon (if it deſerve the conflict,) be it ſharp or ſmooth.

The 25. *of* June 1658.

THE END.

A ſecond Reply to Peter's *Appendix, which pretends to anſwer the* Poſt-haſte Reply.

THE firſt appearance of his *Appendix* begins at Page 205. which in order of time and place ſhould have preceded, as being the cavelling ground of his *Adverti ſements* on the *three Hiſtories*, which yet he placeth before; and concerning it he hath ſpent thoſe numerous Pages, and which hereafter we anſwer. And therefore we begin upon his *Appendix* in the firſt place.

Page 207.] Concerning this Page, his firſt reſolution of ſilence had been his beſt Counſel, for now in attempting to take off thoſe *Accuſations* (as he ſtyles them) he hath confirm'd them, and made thoſe wounds, he gave himſelf, to be the more incurable.

Ibid.] As for his *diſturbance of the fame of the late moſt reverend and learned Primate*, himſelf muſt have the preheminence, being the firſt and ſole perſon of ours (unleſs he be admitted into the Ro-

miſh Clergy) that ever was guilty of it. He began it whilſt the Primate was living, and proſecuted it after his death, with all the violence that might be expected from an Enemy. As to the quotations he makes out of his own ſeveral undigeſted Pamphlets to excuſe himſelf, they have only this ſenſe, *viz. If the Scandal he had raiſed on the Primate were but ſilently received (and ſo believed) he would be quiet.* His laying aſide of that Argument is of no value, unleſs he had revoked it.

Page 208.] As to that Page, I ſay again, what the two Honorable Perſons mentioned by me have given under their hands, and ſo atteſted, and alſo offer their Oaths therein, is enough to ſatisfie all unbyaſſed Perſons. And for his Author he how boaſts of, (yet names none) If he be a wiſe man, he will not be willing to appear againſt the Primats own Declaration, and thoſe other Teſtimonies, beſides the Improbability ſo fully ſhewed heretofore: If he be not wiſe, 'tis not much material. But I have done with it.

Ibid.] He confeſſeth, that *James Howel* (to whoſe bare Name, he might have added the Title due to him, being of better repute than *Peter Heylin*) hath quitted that diſtinction *of a perſonal and political Conſcience* by his *Atteſtation* of my Hiſtory, wherein I have mentioned it, and is clear enough expreſſed: But that *Peter* hath a trick when he is at a loſs to make a large circumlocution about the ſenſe, only to amuze the Reader; the thing is apparent by his own words, wherein he was ſo conſcious to himſelf, as that he had not the face here to repeat them, which are theſe, *If the Hiſtorian did*

ſay

ſay any thing of it, it is expunged by Mr. Howel, *whom it only concerns, when he had peruſed his Hiſtory, and paſſed his approbation of it,* (Petrus Reſp. pa. 144.) ſo that his preſumptuous concluſion is but a ſhadow, and will vaniſh with any intelligent Reader.

Page 209.] *For the abrogating of the Articles of* Ireland; No rational unbiaſſed Reader but may be ſatisfied in the Doctors Miſ-information of that paſſage; and if he had not a brow that could not bluſh, he would not have touched any more on that ſtring: but ſeeing he will not own any Ingenuity in the clear acknowledgement of his miſtake, let him dye in it; I ſuppoſe few or none live in that opinion with him.

Two pages following are ſpent in masking and unmasking himſelf, with ſo much tergiverſation, that I let them paſs; only in page 210. I find him moſt galled with that teſtimony which Doctor *Prydeaux* and Doctor *Hackwell* give of him, and inſtead of healing the wound, he hath made it more wide, and is therein found indeed his own ſelf Revenger.

As concerning Dr. *Prydeaux* (page 211.) firſt he profeſſeth himſelf to have been his Enemy in that buſineſs, in that he ſaith page 212. *If he had been called to the Hearing of it before the late King, it is not probable Dr.* Prydeaux *had gone off ſo clearly with thoſe evaſions.* 2. He acknowledgeth page 113. *That the paper publiſhed was of Dr.* Prydeaux *own penning, and given by him amongſt his friends.* 3. In page 214. *That he oppoſed Dr.* Prydeaux *in his Lectures* De viſibilitate Eccleſiæ, *and* (affecting a ſingularity) *went a different way from him and other Tractates, in and about*

that time. 4. He uſeth thoſe of the *Waldenſis* and *Wickliffiſts*, (as he ſtyles them) very coarſly, calling them *ſcattered Conventicles*, charging them with *Heterodoxes in Religion*, who, I have heard and read, ſuffered very much under the tyranny of the See of *Rome*. 5. He highly magnifies *the Writers of the Church of* Rome, and in ſpecial *Bellarmine for his cordial and ſtout maintenance of ſome fundamental points of Faith*, comparing *him with any of the Divines or learned men of the Reformed Churches*, entituling him *Nobiliſsimus Cardinalis*, and ſo much himſelf confeſſeth; but by another Witneſs, I have been told, that he did alſo then, and at other ſuch times, accumulate divers others, not only the like, but greater Titles.

6. He confeſſeth (page 215.) that upon this, Dr. *Prydeaux cenſured him in the Schools for a Papiſt, and one of* Bellarmines *Diſciples*. For my part, I cannot but ſubſcribe to ſo learned a Teſtimony: and if it be ſo, it were better for him to appear the ſame, than thus to diſguiſe himſelf to the diſhonour of our profeſſion. This whole Relation ſpeaks little or nothing to the Doctors reputation; *Out of thine own mouth will I judge thee*. What he tells us immediately after, *of his two Sermons at* Woodſtock, *and of the commendation given him by ſome of the Court*, as they muſt be his own Flatterers, ſo it appears they were no judicious wiſe men by the over-much latitude in it, (*ibid.*) *as if in thoſe two Sermons he had done more againſt Popery, than all the Sermons Dr.* Prydeaux *had preached in his life time*; as it was an abſurd, ridiculous rant, ſo it is worſe becomming his own pen to be the Trumpet thereof. And how it agrees with his

his *hæsitation, whether the Religion of Popery be Idolatrous and superstitious?* (as he doth in his *Examen Historicum* of Mr. *Fullers* History) I leave it unto any man to judge, I am sure in it he strayes from the *Homilies* of the Church of *England*, who do fully determine it. And what that Error was which he preached in a Sermon at *Westminster*, for which the Dean publickly rebuked him in the Pulpit, saying, *Sir no more of that*, and persisting therein he stroke the Pulpit with his staff, saying, *No more of that I say*, I leave to his own memory, it being very likely to be a kin to this.

And whereas he saith (page 216.) that he maintained this position, *that the Church could not erre*, unless he have some unknown reserve, I know no point concludes him more, to be what Dr. *Prydeaux* apprehended him, and so I begin to think I was not at first much mistaken in conceiving of that *Anonimous Observator* (Peter Heylin) who began to write to the disparagement of the late Primat, to have been some Agent of the *See* of *Rome*.

Nay, as if he had not injured himself sufficiently, he goes on to tell us, (page 217.) *of the opposition he made to Dr.* Prydeaux, *and of his judgement in the questions propounded, and of a check given to Dr.* Prydeaux *by the late Archbishop of Canterbury.* To what end is all this? is it, or can it be any reputation for him thus to thwart Dr. *Prydeaux*? will he put his in the same scale with him? Well, as we know Dr. *Prydeaux* was an eminent and a pious person, so it appears Dr. *Heylin* was a Disturber of him, and hath in this very Book of his *Examen Historicum* confirm'd it sufficiently, in the abuse of Mr. *Thomas Fuller*, one

of better reputation than himself; and therein (sooth for to say) I cannot but commend him, he alwaies aims at high and worthy persons, not spending his Bolt (soon shot) upon such as are of mean esteem. We have his own Confession, and so the Crime is no *new one*, (as he saith) but an old one, with which seeing he hath charged himself, what need we any further Witness? He comes off but poorly from the *Hiss*, and is as much mistaken in his confident conclusion; this whole Relation with all prudent men *making very much for the honour of Dr.* Prydeaux, *and* Peter Doctors *own disreputation.* And so I leave him in the dirt with which he hath bespattered himself sufficiently.

Page 219.] As for that misplacing of the words by the Printer, *viz.* Dr. *Hackwell Archdeacon of* Surrey *and of* Exeter *College*, for Dr. *Hackwell* of *Exeter* College, and *Archdeacon* of *Surrey*, was not so worthy his Discourse as thus to spend six lines about it.

Now, as for Dr. *Hackwells certificate of him* (p. 220) it had been his wisest way to have let that die also; first, the return he makes (p. 222.) *to the diminution of* Dr. *Hackwells abilities, charging him with weakness in penning of his book, & affirming his own tale of* St. George *and the Dragon far excelling him in the Answers*, these are not to be heeded, being only his own testimony, and will be as little effectual to the injuring of the fame and worth of that person, as what he hitherto vented, hath been to the late *Primat* or Dr. *Prydeaux*. For his language (p. 223.) of Dr. *Reynolds* & Dr. *Hackwell* (both eminent professors of the Protestant Religion) *and the rest of that gang* (those

(thoſe are his words) a Jeſuite would have ſaid little more; But ſtill 'tis like himſelf, as in the words thereafter following he hath the like again, which I diſdain to repeat. *And as to his magnifying the Roman writers, the Legendaries*, he does not deny it, but defends himſelf in it. Theſe being the Premiſes, the *Concluſion*, (which he only denies) muſt undoubtedly follow, of Dr. *Hackwells* cenſure of him, viz. *That his words will hardly paſſe for a commendation or a ſlaunder.*

And in (p. 224.) as to my ſaying *that he hath made good that term of Sophiſtry throughout his Book*, he accuſeth himſelf of it, in the repetition of my words by halfs, or disjointed: *And for the rules of Grammar* (which he would have the world know he hath not forgot) beſides, that he deſcends too much from himſelf, to make ſo long a narrative about it (better becomming ſome Country Pedagogue) I am ſure they are better ſenſe, than what his Comment thereon doth give them; for in a word this is all, I having ſpoken of a *Sophiſtry* of his (in his book) immediately before, I added, *which indeed are ſo many*, is not this cleer enough to be underſtood? viz. *which Sophiſtries are ſo many?* Yet *Peter* would have it amended into a calmer word, viz. *Errors*, but they plainly relate to *Sophiſtries*; which I thought fit to inſtance in one of his (p. 225.) where he maintaineth a *Copulative and a Diſjunctive to be all one*, and that which himſelf here confeſſeth, viz. *that it is not material, in which ſenſe they be uſed, differeth little from it.*

And ſo we have an end of him, though (p. 226.) he goes out like the ſnuff of a candle, with an ill ſent

of

of ſome unſavory language againſt Dr. *Hackwell*, not much to be valued; only let me tell him, as *to his reputation*, which he here at laſt *much boaſts of, to have been with the generality of this Nation*, certainly he hath looked on himſelf with ſome Multiplying Glaſſe, for I can witneſſe, that with the Court and Parliament, Clergy and Commonalty, he had the leaſt of reſpect, and as much of the general hatred as any of his profeſſion; he being indeed of ſuch an harſh diſpoſition, that few perſons could conſort with him: And ſo he continued during the Court and Parliament, as appears by the ſpeech of a worthy Member, Sir *Benjamin Ruddier*, 7 *Novemb. Anno* 1640. After he had traced the proceedings of ſome of the Clergy, very much to their rebuke, *he complains about dancing upon Sundayes, that they would fain be at ſome thing that were like the Maſſe that will not bite, a muzzled Religion; they would evaporate and diſpirit the power and vigour of Religion, by drawing it out into ſolemn ſpecious formalities, into obſolete antiquated Ceremonies new furbiſhed up. And* Mr. Speaker (ſaid he) *this is the good work in hand which Dr.* Heylin *hath ſo often celebrated in his bold Pamphlets. All his Acts and Actions are ſo full of mixtures, Involutions and complications, as there is nothing cleer, nothing ſincere in any of his proceedings, &c.* and much more, which I forbear.

'Tis true, this Dr. *Heylin* was intertained by ſome perſons, a fit bold Agent to be made uſe of in the oppoſing of ſuch whom they pleaſed ſhould be affronted, and that for promotion (of which yet, they did not think him much worthy) he would adventure upon the broaching any thing for ſeveral ends, and this is his Character.

I

I ſhall only add this, that it had been very undecent in me to have dealt thus with any other of his *profeſsion*, which I very much reverence in them; but he hath made himſelf ſo cheap and contemptible, by his often perſonal biting and ſcandalizing eminent men, that he is held fit thus to be handled, he having been, and is, the *Bourefeau* of the age that diſturbs all men; And as to my ſelf, for his further threats, I have learnt to deſpiſe them.

Then in his very winding up of the bottome of his *Appendix*, a *Note* (as he calls it) *overſlipt him concerning the Affairs of Oxon.* Not at all relating to this difference, yet he directs the Reader to Folio ( ) blank; but where, or in what Book, or of what Author, by Name or Title, he doth not expreſſe, only he mentioneth Mr. *Fuller*, and Mr. *Sanderſon*: Some Crotchet it ſeems, was in his pate, which neither he, nor his Agent underſtood, and therefore we have it imperfect. And ſo having proſecuted him thus far by *purſute*, I ſhall now bring him from his Arreſt, unto his Arraignment.

The Arraignment

OF

Dr. *PETER HEYLIN'S* ADVERTISEMENT:

ON

The three Hiſtories

{ *Mary* Queen of *Scots*, King *James*, & King *Charles* } Vindicated,

---

By the Author *WILLIAM SANDERSON*, Eſq;

LONDON,

Printed by *Tho. Leach*, 1658.

The Preface.

DId not my Judgement tell me, that *Peter Heylin*, Dr. of Divinity, his *Aavrtiſements* were not the reſults of the wiſeſt ſort of Readers, I ſhould willingly acquieſce in this difference: for as *I* have reaſon to think that there are a Judicious party numerous enow on my ſide; ſo have I humility ſufficient to confeſſe, that I may in ſome things be ſubject to miſtake (with which I am aſſured, his writings do abound) But yet, I cannot allow him ſuch a compleatneſſe, and inerrability in his *Examen*, as to exclude my ſelf from a Vindication, or to ſwallow ſuch large and hard Morſels before I chew them; the paſſage of his Gouſet hath been obſerved, that *Mountains* of *Errors* have gone down with him, without regret.

For my ſelf, I am reſolved, that nothing of paſsion, petulancie, or deſire to contradict,

or vanity to cleer my ſelf, ſhall have any bias upon my Judgement, to make me gratifie my will, which reaſon and reputation doth not command me to obſerve. And truly (as *I* was deſired by ſome friends) *I* could perhaps be content to take this as his laſt potion, at this time, for once and no more; but then, it is like he means to preſcribe ſuch others, as a diet for me to feed upon, without obſerving of a mean, or reſolving of an end.

And indeed concerning this *Grand Examiner* of other mens writings (this *alter Poſſevinus*, whoſe office he uſurps) if any man were at leaſure to *Advertiſe* his miſtakes, Errors, and idle paſſages, in ſome of his, eſpecially his Geography, Countries, Rivers, Nations and Names never in being; His whole Hiſtory of Saint *George* and the *Dragon* ſufficiently detected by learned men, not to mention all his erroneous opinions in his writings, he would find work enough, and ſhould have done well to amend his own miſtakes, before he had medled with others, and to have bruſht his own Coat, which in many places is ſo foul, that needs a Rubber to clean it. But *I* forbear any more, and come to the matter.

The

The Arraignment.

THis *Grand Cenſor* is ſo farr ingenuous, as to afford us a Preface to his *Advertiſement* on the *Hiſtory of the Queen of Scots and King James*, and there he tells us, *That he having made an end of his Eccleſiaſtical Animadverſions, he enters upon matters civil, Hiſtorical falſehoods in thoſe Hiſtories. Yet he confeſſeth, in moſt mens opinions he might be better imployed, for I cannot herein find* (ſayes he) *any malitious or dangerous untruths deſtructive to the Church of* England, *or to the fame and honour of Prelates, or the regular Clergie*; And in the concluſion of the Advertiſement (p. 28.) he ſayes, *he muſt do right to the Author himſelf, whom he looks upon, as a man well principalled, and of no ill affection to the Church or State.* I am obliged to his ſevere *Advertiſement* for this truth of the firſt, and to his favour for the laſt; but not for his Aſperſions upon me preſently following, againſt my Expreſſions in my former *Poſt-haſte* Reply, which he is pleaſed now again (as before) to term *Scurrulous*; and yet what cauſe have I to complain, when *in his ſaid Preface to theſe Advertiſements, he compares moſt of our Scripturients* (as he ſtiles them) (Eccleſiaſtical or Civil) *with the Ape-Carrier*

in

in the Hiſtory of Don Quixot, *who cared not if his Comedyes had as many Errors, as there are motes in the Sun, ſo he might get mony by them?* Well boul'd Peter! But here his *Amanuenſis*, or Clerk, Reader, made bold to beg his Maſters Animadverſion, whether *Don Quixot* were a Poet and made playes, or a Scripturient Eccleſiaſtical, or Civil, becauſe he is quoted comparative with ſuch Writers? Neither ſo nor ſo (ſaid the Doctor) he was a warlike Champion, ſuch another as St. *George*; Then (ſaid his Man) you being *Teſtis Temporum*, and your Treatiſe being ſtiled *Examen Hiſtoricum*, let him be called St. *Don*, or the other *Don George*, both alike Champions, and alike fit to be Recorded.

But in earneſt, the Doctor profeſſeth, *that hereafter he reſolves to look back upon his own Errors, and to redeem the time, becauſe his former dayes were evil*, and in this reſolution it were happy for him to acquieſce, for which I ſhall put him into my *Pater Noſter*, but never in my *Creed*. Thus much with his preamble Preface.

The Doctors firſt *Advertiſement* upon which he reads a Lecture, is taken out of my *Introduction*, a miſtake he ſayes, naming [Folio 1. *Mary*, King *Henries* Siſter] *for his daughter* (page the firſt.) An overſight of the Compoſer, the Copy was true, and there being no *Errata* (in my abſence) annexed either to this, or the other Hiſtories, with which he quarrels; the Readers Judgement may amend ſuch overſights with his pen, and never be beholding to a Doctor of Divinities *Advertiſments*.

Fol. 2. [That King *Iames* the fifth, was the 108th. King of *Scotland*.] *It may come neer the truth*

(ſayes

(ſayes the Doctor) *for King James the ſixth, pretended to be but the* 106th. *King*, & quotes an old verſe, *Nobis hæc invicta tulerunt Centum ſex Proavi*, p. 2.) But there were two Kings Soveraignties queſtionable, and never adjudged.

The next is [Fol. 2. that the Pope excommunicates King *H.* 8. and interdicts his dominions, and moves the Emperor and *French* King to be his Enemies, to palliate ſuch potencie he procures an interview with them, at *Nice* in the confines of *Provence*,] The Doctor confeſſeth that *this interview was between the* French *King and the Pope at* Nice, *but far enough* (ſayes he) *from the borders of King* Henries *Dominions, at which* Henry *was not preſent*, p. 2.) Nor do I ſay, he was; Nor did I mention the word *Dominions* in reference to the place of *Interview*, but to the Popes malice of *Interdiction*. Theſe *Advertiſements* refer to the Introduction of the Hiſtory, and now follows the Hiſtory it ſelf.

[Fol. 8. Prelate Biſhops brought in by *Paladius*] but the Doctor cunningly leaves out that which follows [having had (by their favour) (ſaid I) Prieſts and Monks before.] He allows of this as of my *opinion*, and the conſent of *ſome of the Scots, taken* (he ſayes) *from* Buchanan *a fiery Presbyterian, and conſequently a profeſſed Enemy to Biſhops*, p. 3.) and ravelling into a long diſcourſe with this diſtinction, *that Prieſts and Monks might inſtruct the people, but not Governed without the help of Biſhops*; and therefore he aſſerts, *that Prelate Biſhops were not firſt brought in by* Paladius, *as the* Scots *ſay, nor was that Church ſo long a time without Biſhops, as the Engliſh Presbyterians would have it*, p. 4.) but as my Hiſtory is not properly

concerned in that difference, nor do I consent to his opinion, and so it is but *ipse dixit Petrus*.

[Fol. 15. *John Calvin* a Frenchman of *Aquitane*] *Not so* (sayes he) *but of Picardie*, p. 4.) some Authors disagree say I: Nor is it much material, no more than the next, to which he skips, *fol.* 91.

[Fol. 91. The Lords of *Aubigny* take name from the village so called in *Aquitane*] he sayes in the *County of Berry*, p. 4. (it may be so.)

[Fol. 20. And therefore to strike in with his Son and Successor she kept his Fathers obsequies, with Magnificent solemnities in St. *Pauls* Church *London*,] the obsequies of the French King *Henry* 2. performed by Queen *Elizabeth*: *Not so much* (sayes the Doctor) *on that ground, but to preserve her own Religion, the honor of our Church with Papist Princes*, p. 4.) Wee may agree in this too, it might be for both; yet the political State interest (confederacy) is the usual ground, and more obvious to the civil affairs, rather than to the Ecclesiastical.

[Fol. 27. An hundred Marks a year was then sufficient for a single Minister] *Understand not* (says he) *a Mark* 13 *s.* 4 *d. English, but* 13 *d. ob. Scotish*, p. 4.) and so he goes on, as to supply the pretended defects of my Expression, by his Arithmetical observation, how much those different marks *English* and *Scotish* amount unto: so that the Reader may imagine, it was my narrow opinion [*that so little, was sufficient for a Minister*] but my discourse is full enough and satisfactory; for speaking of the baldness of the *Scots* first Ministry, and [*their supplications* (*say I*) *for their maintenance, being as yet at the will of the people, a reasonable pittance was thought sufficient*

ent contribution, &c. for by compute of their own Lords of the Congregation, 100. *Marks a year, was then ſufficient for a ſingle Miniſter*, viz. *five old Pieces.*] the very words of the Record; And leſt any Reader ſhould be miſtaken herein, the Margin hath theſe Notes, *very ſmall, a Scotiſh Mark is but* 13 *d. ob. Sterling; an old piece* 22 *s. in gold.* But I am almoſt weary to anſwer the Examinors *Advertiſements* ſo mean, and yet ſo many, as I fear may tyre the Reader out-right, yet he makes haſte, and skips on, to *fol.* 53.

[Fol. 53. Claymed by *Charls* of *Aragon*, and *Peter de Taracene*, for the Iſle of *Cicile*,] Having occaſion to diſcourſe of Trials of right by Combate, I mention examples, and amongſt others, theſe Challenges. He ſayes no; *It was once intended between* Peter *King of* Aragon *and* Charls *Earl of* Anjou, *p.* 5.) True too, ſay I, they were two ſeveral Combates, ſeveral perſons, at ſeveral times; I ſay [claymed] he ſayes *intended*, for neither of them fought.

The like he marks at *fol.* 55. [there were ſome preparations in King *James* time intended, between *Rey* and *Ramſy*,] *Not ſo* (ſayes the Doctor) *but in King Charls time, p.* 5.) Certainly ſay I, an overſight of the Compoſer, for in my Hiſtory of King *Charls*, I mention that whole Tryal very particularly, and therefore this *Advertiſement* ſo obvious, needs no reproach on me.

[Fol. 83. *Katherine de Medicis*, Pope *Clements* Brothers daughter,] he ſayes *ſhe was not*, and ravels into her Pedigree to prove his Aſſertion, p. 5.) But then take altogether, I ſaid [that I may not omit

omit the horrid Maſſacre throughout all *France*, upon the Perſons of the reformed *Religion*, called by the Adverſaries *Hugonotes*; the Hiſtory is ſo horrid, and the more uncertain in particulars, becauſe the Papiſts piece it out with ſome excuſes: but the truth was written by one *Erneſt Varamond* of *Freezeland* then living, *An.* 1573.] And becauſe I would not be ſuſpected to adulterate the ſtory, I cauſed it to be printed in another Letter or Character, (as it is uſual when an Author recites anothers words) ſo then it was not for me to alter thoſe words (Brothers Daughter) not being mine own, but the Authors; Nor was it then, or is it now, neceſſary for me to examine the neerneſſe of her relation, with which the Doctor troubles the Reader.

Another monſtrous miſtake [fol. 89. *Poictour*] for *Poictou*, p. 6.) the letter *r.* added by the Compoſer, and overſlipt by the Corrector.

Another worſe, a word miſtaken [fol. 96. *Duke*] for *Earl*, p. 6.) what need Mr. Doctor Advertiſe this, when the next line mentions him *Earl* of *Arran*, and ſo throughout the *Paragraph*, and forty times before, and after?

Another, where I pray? *Mary* in fol. 149. a miſname [*Mettallan*] whom *afterwards is named* Maitland, *p.* 6.) I do ſo, from his name *Metallanus*, where the Latin writers mention him; and *Maitland* the Scotiſh writers call him, and here the Riddle is reſolved. Yet another, ten folioes before, *viz.* fol. 139.

[Fol. 139. Hiſtory of Queen *Elizabeth* writ by *Martin*] he ſayes *Martin writ no farther than King* Henry

Henry 8, *the rest possibly is clapt too by the Publisher of that History, being* Camdens Annals *of that* Queen, p. 6.) If the Doctor be not mistaken in his *possibly*, yet I am right, to intitle the whole History to *Martin*, whose name is to the Title page as the Author, be the Publisher whomsoever the Doctor can find out.

[Fol. 156. The Leaguers for some Justice in their Rebellion elect Cardinal *Bourbon*, a degree nearer the Crown than *Navarr*,] No sayes the Doctor, *not so neer*, p. 6.) and spends half a page to prove it, when in truth the word (*as*) is wanting, *as a degree nearer*, that is, the Rebels would have him to be so believed, to countenance their siding with him.

[Fol. 161. Sir *Thomas Randolph* bred a Civilian, taken from *Pembroke* College in *Oxon*,] Not so sayes he; how then say I? *That which is called Pembroke College, was in that time called Broadgates, p. 7.)* a pretty quibble. Nay then the Doctor is out also, for Sir *Thomas Randolph* was not bred a Civilian, taken from *Pembroke* College in *Oxon*, nor from *Broadgates* say I, *Tom Randolph* was indeed, but Sir *Thomas Randolph* was made Knight some yeers after at *whitehall*. Or thus, *Julius Cæsar* came out of *France* into *England*. Not so neither; but came out of *Gallia* into *Britanie*. Or thus, Dr. *Peter Heylin* was a poor Scholar in *Magdalene* College in *Oxon*. Not so sayes he, tell truth say I, *Peter Heylin* indeed was, but Dr. *Peter Heylin* was never a poor Scholar there; O Sir, I cry your Doctorship mercy, the Iesuite that taught distinctions, was but a Dunce to you Doctor.

[Fol. 189. The other Title was of the Infant of *Spain*] he sayes *that I leave out the most material Title* (viz. *that is to say*) *from the Daughter of John a Gaunt*

Duke

Duke of Lancaster, *p.* 7.) dear Mr. Doctor, how prove you this, viz. *that is to say, the most material Title*? However, I do not leave it out, for speaking of the treasonable designs against the right succession of Queen *Elizabeth*, and her lawful Heir, mentioning several Titles in *Dolemans* Book devised by the Jesuite *Parsons*; [The other Title (say I) was of the *Infant* of *Spain*, and therein they use their Catholike Doctrine to make it up with monstrous lies.

First from *Constance* daughter to the Conqueror, &c. (though our Chronicles agree, that she dyed without issue.)

Secondly, From *Elynor* daughter to *Henry* 2. maried to *Alphonsus* King of *Castile*.

Thirdly, And descends from *Blanch* his daughter.

Fourthl yFrom *Beatrice* daughter of *Henry* 3. of *England*.

Fifthly, From the *Portugal* family of *John a Gaunt* Duke of *Lancaster*.]

Herein I expresse but what the Jesuite *Parsons* published falsely and malitiously to the prejudice of Queen *Elizabeth* and her lawful descendent; and the fifth Title from *John a Gaunt* answers the Doctors *Advertisement*, and is not left out; but why Mr. Doctor should joyn with the *Jesuite*, and assist him with one *most material Title*, when none but Traytors could justly approve of any Material or lawful Title but that of King *James* of *Scotland*, doth somewhat discover himself?

[Fol. 191. *Hawkins*, *Drake*, *Baskervile* fire some Towns in the Isle of *Dominica*,] *they fired* (saies he) some

ſome Towns in Hiſpaniola, and that Town of *Dominica*, but *not on the Iſle*, p. 7.) You are miſinformed (Geographer) that Town is named *Domingo*, and not *Dominica*; but I ſay again, they fired Towns in the Iſle of *Dominica*, one of the *Charybes*, and although you ſay that thoſe *Iſlands had enmity with the Spaniard*, it is no abſolute reaſon, but that they may deſerve hoſtility and *firing* by ill uſage of Strangers, which they did to the *Engliſh*, thinking them Pirates; for ſo ſayes the *Pamphlet* of that voyage, publiſhed at their return, *an.* 1597. which I can produce.

How now? Hook here, look back about 40 *Folioes*; it ſeems his Clerk *Amanuenſis* overpaſſed this, of great conſequence, another *Miſnomer* [Fol. 157. *Carmardin*] for *Carwardin*, p. 7.) Nay then the Doctor muſt excuſe me if I tell his miſtake, this Gentleman was neer Kinſman to my Father, he diſcovered the Eſtate of the Cuſtoms to Queen *Elizabeth*, he was converſant in my Fathers Family, I have ſeen him ſign his name very often, and can produce his letters (*Carmardin.*)

[Fol. 229. Sir *Thomas Erskin* created Earl of *Kelly*, and by degrees Knight of the *Garter*,] No (ſayes he) *firſt of the Garter, and then* Earl, p. 8.)

[Fol. 238. Sir *John Danvers*,] for Sir *Charls*, p. 8.) Oh Sir, you are miſtaken, his name was Sir *John*, and not Sir *Charls*.

Fol. 293. The Lord *Norris*,] for Sir *John Norris* (ſayes he, p. 8.) Nay then we muſt be overtroubled with the Doctor, for I ſaid [that the Deputy of *Ireland* erects *Mount Norris* there, in memory of that gallant *John* Lord *Norris*, under whom he firſt exercited Arms.] 'Tis true, that when he firſt exxerciſed Arms, the other was but Sir

John,

John, but afterwards he had a Generals command, and was therefore called Lord *Norris*, as is uſually the Title of General Commanders, for ſo was *Cæcil* ſtiled, before he was made Viſcount *Wimbleton*, and ſo *Horatio Vere*, called Lord *Vere* before he was created *Baron*, and it would have been a diminution to *Norris* his merit, for me not to have afforded him the higher Title *Lord*, by which he had been called.

Turn back again, we are directed to [fol. 223. He was eldeſt Son to *Walter Devereux*, created by Queen *Elizabeth* Earl of *Eſſex* and *Ewe*,] Not ſo ſayes he, *but Earl of Eſſex only*, p. 8.) The Title *Ewe* he had before by deſcent from *Henry de Burgo-Caro* or *Bourchier*, the Son of *William Bourchier* (created Earl of *Ewe* at *Maunt* in *Normandy* by *Henry* 5.) and of his wife the Coheir of *Thomas de Woodſtock* Duke of *Gloceſter*, and *Eleanor* his wife, one of the heirs of *Humphrey de Bohun* the laſt Earl of *Hereford* and *Eſſex*, by King *Edward* 4th. His Title *Ferrars* of *Chartly* deſcends from Sir *John Devereux*, whoſe Son Sir *Walter Devereux* Viſcount *Hereford* by *Mary* his wife, had iſſue Sir *Richard Devereux* the Father of *Walter*, who was made Earl of *Eſſex* by Queen *Elizabeth* in right of his Mariage with *Cecily Bourchier*. So then for the Doctors better underſtanding, theſe are that Earls Titles, and thus deſcended.

[Ibid. *Robert* Earl of *Eſſex*, the Son of *Walter*, went Commander in chief in the Expedition to *Portugal*,] *whereas* (ſayes he) *he was but a Volunteer, and had no command*, p. 8.) 'Tis true (ſay I) *he was not in Commiſſion*, but coming aboard he was taken into

into Councel, and admitted Commander in chief of a ſquadron of ſhips, when the Fleet ſeparated into ſeveral ſervices, which I mentioned before, *fol.* 155. in theſe words [we call it the Earl of *Eſſex's Expedition*, who indeed ambitious of common fame put himſelf to Sea, and got aboard the Fleet; conceiting that their reſpect to his birth and quality, would receive him their chief, but was miſtaken; yet he carried all the Commendations with the Common men, as Titles get advantage from the merit of other mens deſervings,& though I know, that this comment upon that *Lord*, gains little credit in theſe our dayes.]

Then afterwards, *fol.* 233. (now in queſtion) having occaſion to mention his treaſonable inſurrection, and yet to afford him the beſt of his merit, before his final fall, I intitle him (as in a word) [chief of that expedition into *Portugal*] he being then ſo generally eſteemed, but whether *Cheif* as in reference to command, or chief in title and birth, I inſiſt not upon; the other officers being in degree but Knights.

[Fol. 234. The Earl of *Eſſex* went Deputy into *Ireland*] *Not ſo* (ſayes he) *but Lord Lieutenant*, p. 8.) And is it not uſual to mention a Lord Lieutenant of *Ireland* by the title of *Deputy*, when it is included in the other?

Back again to *fol.* 231. for we muſt queſtion King *Charls* his birth day [the 26 of *Feb.* 1600. at *Dunferlin* in *Scotland*] *Not ſo* (ſayes he) *but in November*,] This of the Month, is miſtaken there, for I mention it before, and after right; It ſhall be amended.

[Fol. 261. Queen *Elizabeth* gave up the Ghoſt to God, on that day of her birth from whom ſhe had it.] *Not ſo* (ſayes he) *for ſhe was born on the Eve of the Nativity, but died on the Eve of the Annunciation*, p. 9.) But I ſay again, that ſhe was born and dyed on the Eves of the *Annunciation* of the Virgin *Mary*.

Another monſtrous miſtake, and then the Doctor will have done as to this Hiſtory, but we muſt fetch a freak backward, whither think you? 253. *folioes*, ev'n to *fol.* 8. which eſcaped his helpers, but he will have it in.

[Fol. 8. Queen *Mary* of *Scotland* left her Kingdome to her Son, who was born a King] *Not ſo* (ſayes he) *King Iames was born in* Iune, *and crowned in* July, p. 9.) 'Tis true too: He was born in *Iune, an.* 1566. and ſtiled King at his birth, but becauſe his Mother was compelled to quit the Regencie to her Sons Guardians, and they to make her Reſignation the more ſure, crowned him afterwards. And we know that *Coronation* is but the ceremony of ſucceſſion, Kings ſucceſſive, are by birth ſo before *Coronation*. And King *Iames* in one of his ſpeeches tells the Parliament of *England, that he was not to be taught by them, he being an old King, as antient as his birth-day*.

And theſe are all the miſtakes, and every one, that this Doctor of Divinity can find out to Advertiſe. And thus have we been harraſed, this Hiſtory ſuffering under cenſure in terms poſſitive by his Preface, but how prooved in his Examinations of 262 large folioes, and how criminal, we ſubmit to the Readers judgement: And truly in my own conſcience I ſtand juſtified for a faithful Hiſtorian

ſtorian, excuſable in thoſe particulars, which he hath marked for grand Errors: when in ſo great a body, he is not able to find out any other blemiſh. And yet theſe Hiſtories have been heretofore pittifully obſerved by *Anonimus*, his Agent, whom he patronizeth, and which I anſwered, and now but the ſame again; And his *Advertiſements* on the Hiſtory of *King Charls*, not more nor leſſe than petty unneceſſary Cavils, the Compoſers, Correctors, or Printers eſcapes, which an ordinary Reader may amend. And by compariſon we may obſerve the Errors of his petty Apendix, which I have not heretofore noted, *viz.*

Querit, for texit; *not*, for non; *of ore*, for in ore; *Midſomer laſt*, for Midſomer 1657; *Arch-Biſhop of Canterbury*, for Biſhop of St. Davids; *Bleſh*, for Blatſoe; *anno* 1627, for 1629; *Naſſantiæ*, for Naſſoniæ; *but three*, for three Dudlyes; *at the Valley*, for the Battel; *of the firſt*, for his changing of the firſt deſign; *VVillam*, for Millain; *Proviſo*, for promiſe; *Seas*, for Scales; *the firſt*, for the laſt; *the leaſt*, for them laſt; and many more, his pages not half way figured, and yet ſee how he beſtrides me, if my feet but ſlip; and ſo I leave him.

I am therefore at a ſtand with my ſelf, if I ſhall need to trace him any farther in my purſute after his ſent, which leaves ſo foul a ſavour, ere I overtake him in the end; He being hereby brought and arraigned ſufficiently enough, (I conceive;) or leave him to the Judgement of the wiſer ſort, who have good cauſe to blame me for exerciſing their patience with theſe unneceſſary Cavils (the *Remains* are no other than ſuch like) which render him

ridiculous to the Reader, and may mark me for a fool, if I follow him any farther for the present, having some occasions of business, that better concern me, at this time.

Vnless for some satisfaction to the Reader, it may be convenient for me to Anatomise his Preface only, or *short Survey* (twelve pages) to his *Advertisements on the History of King Charls.*

And therein his grave censure of that whole History at a clap, being no lesse than 1150 large Folioes. *So that* (sayes he) *no sense can be picked out of it, but by circumstance and conjecture only, which defects* (he tells us) *he had observed in the Histories of Queen* Mary *of* Scotland, *and her Son King* James, *published without the name of any Author, but now laid claim to by the History of King* Charls, p. 34.) His nonsense is thus to be understood, *viz.* That he would have observed the same defects in the former Histories, had he known them to be *Sandersons*, but they were published without the name of any Author, till now, that they are laid claim to by the Author of the History of King *Charls*; this he would seem to say.

But in earnest, this his first *Advertisement* is so false, as that I expected his craving pardon of the gentle Reader in his numerous *Errata*, annexed to this his petty Pamphlet, by which *Errata* he appears to have conned over his *Advertisements* for to be published compleat, and yet therein I find not this untruth amended. A wonder to me, that none could read to him the Authors name *William Sanderson*, in words at length, subscribed, not only to the Title pages of those Histories, but also to this

of

of King *Charls*. And then, to confirm his bold Censure of the defects in the former (of Queen *Mary* & King *Iames*) he refers us *to a Learned Judicious friend of his*, but ſhames to name him: Nor is it neceſſary, he being belike of the Doctors gang, and may not be known. And alſo he refers us *to the Obſervations upon Perſons and Paſſages, in the Hiſtories of the Queen of* Scots *and King* James, p. 35.) Indeed theſe *Obſervations* were publiſhed without a name or literal mark, & were ſentenced of all th eReaders to be mean and ſcurrulous, Yet the Author of thoſe Hiſtories *William Sanderſon* by name, vouchſafed to give Anſwer to that Libel.

And as concerning that *Anſwer*, the Doctor meeting me in the ſtreet at *London*, his own invitation and his guide, conducted me into a Lane, and through a narrow paſſage or Entry up to his Chamber, where he begged of me my *Anſwer* to that Libel, which I ſent him; and I profeſſe to all the world I cannot of my ſelf find out that place: So then his Tale, p. 41. of my finding him out at his Lodging, and what he inſiſts thereon, is moſt untrue; But hereby it appears, that the Doctor could not be ignorant of the Author of that Anſwer, and of thoſe Hiſtories, and ever ſince, the Libeller is not known, and it is like he being conſciencious of his Crime, durſt never reply thereto; nor hath any Perſon owned it, till now that Doctor *Peter Heylin*, the *Grand* Examiner and *Surveyor General*, takes upon him to be ſuſpected that Libeller, and quotes the Libel *verbatim*, to ſtrengthen his impertinent *Advertiſements*, with malitious calumnies to boot, on the whole bodies of thoſe Hiſtories, ſo

that

that if the Doctor cannot cleer himself of being the *Pater* of that Libel, he now appears plainly to be the Patron; and yet I must remember what I mentioned before of him, concerning those two Histories of the *Queen of Scots* and *King James*, *viz. I cannot herein* (sayes the Doctor) *find any malitious or dangerous untruths destructive to the Church of* England, *or to the fame and honor of Prelates, or the Regular Clergy.*

Which Histories are divided into several volumes, and according to the many years Reign of these Soveraigns, and their times of Action, must therefore necessarily be very large, *viz.* that of the Queen of *Scots* and her Son, *&c.* 262 large Folioes; the other of King *James*, 338. Folioes; and this of King *Charls*, no lesse than 1150. Folioes. Yet we find them in a word rubbed over by the Doctor, with the stains of a petulent Censure; and yet again, this self same Doctor concludes in few words, and to render himself reproachful, for what he had spoken before or shall say hereafter, he avers, *But to reduce these Items to a summa totalis as to the Histories, considering their length, there is much which deserves to be laid up in the Registers of succeeding ages*, p. 39.) And as to the History of King *Charls. I cannot but acknowledg* (sayes he) *that he hath done more right to the King and the Church of* England, *than could be expected in these times, Vtinam sic semper errasset*, p. 40.) so saith Doctor *Peter Heylin, Testis Temporum, the grand* Examinor *of all Scripturients by his* Examen Historicum; but as others have censured him (Dr. *Hackwell* by name) so say I, *The condition of the Man being such, as his words hardly passe for a commendation or a slaunder,*

his

his teſtimony as to the truth is not valuable, for, or againſt any Man, or any writing.

And at the caſting up of his *Preface* or *Survey*, concerning himſelf, and his engaging againſt me, he ſayes, *that I have beat him with the Spit, and basted him all over with gall and vinegar, the occaſion of our quarrelling*, p. 42. } but I anſwer, that as to the truth of our difference, I have before in my *Poſthaſte Reply*, very faithfully and ingenuouſly ſet down the occaſion to be otherwiſe, and need not here to be repeated, it being ſumm'd up to my hand in his writings, *viz. his own pragmaticalneſſe and love of revenge.*

And this with modeſty I may averr (whatever his malice can imagine to the contrary) that theſe Hiſtories ſell well, holding up their firſt good price, and thereby are valued in the commodious and profitable vent, with the general acceptation of thoſe that pay for them, an argument ſufficient againſt Dr. *Heylins* Cenſure.

But what occaſion he intends forthwith to deviſe, of quarreling with other Authors, we muſt expect ſome formal reaſons no doubt. He being about (as we are informed) to *Animadvertiſe* on the large volumes and elaborate work of Mr. *Fox* his *Books of Martyrs*, for the Doctor could never indure thoſe ſtories. And that being ſoon diſpatched, then we are to be aſſured of his *Advertiſements* on Sir *Walter Raughleys large Hiſtory of the World.* And afterwards he reſolves to publiſh a ſet form of Apology in excuſe of his own works. And in fine (as the beſt at laſt) *he will examine himſelf, becauſe*

(as

(as he saith of himself) *his former dayes have been evill*, which all good men wish to be amended.

And so Good Night Peter.

The End.